

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the Abstract, Specification and claims 1, 6, 12, 15 and 18 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by the amendment. Reconsideration of claims 1-20 is respectfully requested.

IN THE ABSTRACT

In accordance with the foregoing, the Abstract has been amended. Withdrawal of the objection to the Abstract is respectfully requested.

IN THE SPECIFICATION

In accordance with the foregoing, the Specification has been amended. Withdrawal of the objection to the Specification is respectfully requested.

OBJECTION TO CLAIMS 2-5, 9-11, 13-14, 16-17 AND 19-20

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 2-5, 9-11, 13-14, 16-17 and 19-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. However, reconsideration of claims 2-5, 9-11, 13-14, 16-17 and 19-20 is respectfully requested, based upon the amendments to claims 1, 6, 12, 15 and 18 from which claims 2-5, 9-11, 13-14, 16-17 and 19-20 respectively depend.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 6-8, 12, 15 AND 18 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 6-8, 12, 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "APA") as illustrated in FIGS. 1 and 2. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the APA does not disclose a microwave oven comprising "a stopper which delimits a mounted position of the motor when the motor is rotated, to align the at least one hole of the mounting piece with the hole of the flange," as in claim 1.

Nor does the APA disclose the similar limitations as recited in amended claims 6, 12, 15

and 18.

Instead, the APA discloses in FIGS. 1 and 2, a microwave having a stirrer, wherein holes formed on flanges of a motor for the stirrer are physically aligned with holes formed on a bracket and then the motor is fixed using screws.

Thus, the APA fails to disclose all of the features recited in claims 1, 6, 12, 15 and 18. Therefore, the APA fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Accordingly claims 1, 6-8, 12, 15 and 18 patentably distinguish over the APA. In addition, claims 7-8 patentably distinguish over the APA at least due to their dependency upon claim 6. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 6-8, 12, 15 and 18 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each claim is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and therefore defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection, along with the indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 8, 2004

By: 
Michael D. Stein
Registration No. 37,240

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501